UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

This Document Relates to:

[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO DISMISS DUPLICATIVE CASES

E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-09052-CRB

A.P. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-02105-CRB

T.B. 1475 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-02989-CRB

Jane Roe CL 146 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-03719-CRB

E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-04526-CRB

Arpitkumar Patel v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-05287-CRB

Jane Doe LS 618 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06160-CRB

K.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06178-CRB

19

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having considered Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Duplicative Cases, the Court finds that the Plaintiffs subject to Defendants' Motion have filed two separate but substantively identical complaints in this multidistrict litigation. The later-filed of each of Plaintiffs' two complaints have been dismissed with prejudice to protect the parties' rights and in the interest of judicial economy.

The Court therefore hereby ORDERS that the following eases are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE:

- 1. E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al., No. 3:25-cv-04526-CRB
- 2. Jane Roe CL 146 v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al., No. 3:25-cv-03719-CRB
- 3. K.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al., No. 3:25-cv-06178-CRB
- 4. Patel v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al., No. 3:25-cv-05287-CRB

Additionally, the The Plaintiffs in the above four cases are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE by December 19, 2025, why they should not be required to pay Defendants' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of \$16,278 incurred to file Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Duplicative Cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 2, 2025

